Virginia Council may regulate mines, factories, and railroads, fix prices and suppress disorders. In Wisconsin the council may control the distribution of the supply of food and fuel. In Minnesota,[2] the Commission of Public Safety has been granted the broad power to do all acts and things, not inconsistent with the law, for the protection of life, property and public safety."[3] These powers, however, are to be exercised in subordination to the superior control of national administrative authorities.

Work of Efficiency and Economy Commissions. The movement for reorganization of state administration in the interests of efficiency and economy continues to gather headway. Although the war has focused the attention of the people throughout the country upon international relations, it is nevertheless possible to discern certain by-products of the great conflict in the increased interest of the people in efficient government, both in nation and in state, and in their growing impatience with the results obtained from the cumbrous and antiquated forms of government with which we have hitherto been afflicted. Some positive improvements in state administration have recently been effected. An account has already been given in this REVIEW[4] of the civil administrative code enacted by the legislature of Illinois in 1917. The enactment of this code was the direct result of the investigation made two years previously by the Efficiency and Economy Committee of that state. This code constitutes the most important advance yet made by any state in the direction of improved and simplified administration. In most states which have considered the matter at all, the development is still largely in the investigational stage.

Two official commissions appointed in Colorado and Virginia to investigate the state administration and make recommendations for reorganization in the direction of efficiency and economy have recently issued reports. The Survey Committee of State Affairs of Colorado was created by legislative act of 1915, and consisted of seven members—two appointed by the senate, two by the house of representatives, and three citizens appointed by the governor. It was given large powers of investigation and report, covering practically the whole field of state administration. It secured the assistance of experts from

[2] Laws of 1917, ch. 261.

[3] J. M. Mathews in *American Year Book*, 1917, p. 174.

[4] Vol. XI, No. 2, p. 310.

other states and from the United States bureaus to investigate specific phases of the general subject. The report has been issued in a series of pamphlets, each devoted to a particular topic, concluding with a summary of the findings and recommendations of the committee, accompanied by two charts, one showing the existing organization of the executive branch of the state government and the other indicating tentative proposed changes in certain state departments. On account of lack of time the committee did not recommend a general plan for the complete reorganization of the state administration, but made a number of specific recommendations relating to the offices of governor, secretary of state, state auditor, state treasurer and other officers and boards, together with a number of miscellaneous recommendations relating to such matters as purchasing methods, state finances and budget procedure.

Apparently the Colorado committee is the only similar body which has made a comprehensive survey of the office of state governor. As a result of their investigation they found that, while the governor was ex officio member of a number of state boards, there was nothing in the laws nor in the nature of the duties performed to indicate why the governor was designated a member of some boards and not of others. In regard to the governor's power of appointment the committee found a similar lack of system. They found that, whereas the state engineer is appointed by the governor alone, the five division engineers serving under him cannot be appointed by the governor except with the advice and consent of the senate. The committee recommends that all administrative officers now appointed by the governor with the advice and consent of the senate should be appointed by the governor alone, who, as chief executive, is responsible for results. Further, they recommend that all subordinate employees now appointed by the governor alone or with the consent of the senate should be either under civil service rules and regulations or appointed by the respective administrative officers.

The Virginia Commission on Economy and Efficiency consisted of three members of the legislature and two citizens, appointed under an act of 1916, and "charged with the duty of making a careful and detailed study of the organization and methods of the state and local governments and with reporting to the next general assembly in what way the state and local government can be more efficiently and economically administered." The report of the commission, issued early in 1918, consists of a pamphlet of 67 pages, to which is appended three

charts giving a graphic representation of the three general departments of the state government. The report deals in the main, however, only with the executive department and points out the familiar defects of state administration which are illustrated in the experience of Virginia—such as the diffusion of authority and responsibility, the lack of official accountability for the administration of the state's affairs, the excessive number of petty elective officers, and the useless multiplication of boards, bureaus and other agencies without any attempt to coördinate functions, make readjustments, or establish proper executive control. The commission recommends that the power of appointment, control and removal of all administrative officers should be vested, as far as possible, in the governor. "The governor should be the business manager of the state in fact as well as in name. He should be held responsible for the proper management of all departments and agencies, and should be given the power to have his policies carried out and his orders promptly executed." A number of other miscellaneous suggestions are made, relating to the supervision of accounts, including expense accounts, uniform fiscal year, abolition of fees, uniform office hours, leaves of absence, collective purchasing of supplies, state insurance, civil service regulations and the reorganization of the public school system.

Both the Colorado and the Virginia commissions recommend the introduction of scientific budget systems, the main features of which are similar. The report of the Virginia commission contains a completely drafted bill designed to introduce without constitutional amendment the recommendations of the commission in this respect. The bill as drafted makes the governor the chief budget officer of the state and authorizes him to employ competent assistants in the preparation of the budget. The general assembly is allowed to increase or decrease items in the budget bill as it sees fit; but the proposed bill prohibits either house from considering further or special appropriations, except in the case of emergency, until the budget bill shall have been finally acted upon by both houses, and requires that all bills introduced in either house carrying appropriations be itemized in accordance with the classifications used in the budget.

The Colorado commission also recommends the plan of an executive budget and undertakes to disarm opposition to the proposal by pointing out that, while the legislature should control the purse strings, its handling of estimates, of expenditures and revenues is the assumption of an inherently executive function. "The purpose of the executive is

to carry on the government within the limits set by the legislature. By submitting a budget to the legislature, the executive asks the assent of the legislature to carry on the government according to the plan which he has therein outlined. There is nothing, therefore, in this procedure which can be construed as executive encroachment upon legislative functions." The budget, as recommended by the commission, would be compiled under the direction of the governor and submitted by him to the legislature. In order that the governor may be the better able to carry out this suggestion, the commission suggests that there be created the office of budget and efficiency commissioner, with the necessary expert staff, who should be empowered to investigate the activities of the various boards and institutions. The recommendations as submitted by the commission relating to finances contemplate only such changes as may be made by statute or by changes in the house and senate rules. It is suggested, however, that "there are certain other changes which it would be desirable to effect, but which would require amendment to the constitution, such as the right of the governor and heads of departments, institutions, etc., of the state to appear before the legislature in defense or explanation of requests for funds; provision for executive control by the governor over all executive departments, boards, commissions, offices, or institutions; that the legislature be restricted to reducing any item in the governor's budget for the executive branch of the government and be not permitted to raise any of those items; that budget estimates for the judiciary may be increased by the legislature but not reduced; that no special bill making an appropriation shall be enacted by the legislature unless special provision is made to raise the revenue therefor; provision that all appropriations recommended in the budget be authorized and included in one bill; also provisions protecting the interests of the state in the event of a deadlock between the governor and the legislature on the budget and appropriation bills."

An account of the work of state efficiency and economy commissions has recently been published in a bulletin of the New York Bureau of Municipal Research, entitled "The State Movement for Efficiency and Economy," by Raymond Moley.[5] A report on "Economy and Efficiency Commissions in Other States," by A. C. Hanford, had been published in 1915 in the *Report of the Efficiency and Economy Committee of Illinois* (pp. 975–998). This earlier report covered the work of such

[5] Bulletin No. 90, October, 1917.

bodies in only six states: Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Minnesota and Iowa. The more recent monograph by Mr. Moley gives an account of the work of fourteen state commissions, in addition to that of the state board of public affairs of Wisconsin and the former department of efficiency and economy of New York. A statement of the origin and personnel of each commission is given, followed by chapters dealing successively with the suggestions of the commissions regarding the election of public officers, proposals concerning general administration, the budget, and the administration of public service functions, ending with a chapter on "Results and Conclusions." This monograph will be a welcome aid and guide to those who wish a bird's-eye view of the work of the commissions and a summary in convenient form of their principal recommendations.

Another monograph largely based on the reports of state efficiency and economy commissions is entitled *A Survey of State Executive Organization and a Plan of Reorganization* (1916), by C. H. Crennan, a doctor's thesis submitted at the University of Pennsylvania. It is divided into three chapters dealing respectively with "Present Organization of the State Executive," "State Executive Organization Defective," and "A Plan of Executive Reorganization." The last chapter is the most valuable. The author not only outlines the proposals of the principal efficiency and economy commissions, but also submits a proposed plan of reorganization, based on the analogy of the national government and adapted to conditions in Pennsylvania.

Operation of the Maryland Budget. The first state executive budget system in the United States, and the first system to be made a part of a state constitution, is that of Maryland. The amendment providing for it was ratified by the electors of the state, voting two to one in its favor, on November 7, 1916. Since that time and even before the Maryland system began to operate several other states either adopted the plan almost in its entirety, or took up certain features of it and embodied them in law.[1] An account of the operation of the Maryland system is, therefore, of more than local interest.

[1] Utah has enacted a statute (Ch. 15, Laws 1917) providing for a budget system modeled directly after the Maryland amendment. Two other states have adopted modified forms of the Maryland plan—New Mexico (Ch. 81, Laws 1917) and Delaware (Ch. 278, Laws 1917) adopting the system for one legislative session. West Virginia has passed an act (Ch. 15, Laws 2d ex. sess. 1917) proposing an